DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 116 SP 014 595

AUTHOR Pine, Gerald J.
TITLE Management for Change: Ideologies of Consensus and Conflict in Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; *Change Agents; *Cooperation; Decision Making; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; *Management by Objectives; Needs Assessment; *Organizational Development; Social Values; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

Educational administrators and innovators need to become aware of the ideologies hidden in systematic management and organizational development theory if they wish to provide creative leadership in initiating and implementing educational change. Teacher Corps experience supports the notion that effective change is best implemented through a collaborative working relationship between teachers, administrators, students, and community members. A comparison of the consensus model and the conflict model of governance serves to illustrate the dissimilarities in the various schools of administrative thought. The Teacher Corps attempts to address the dilemma of creating a compromise management system in an educational organization previously structured around either a cold, strictly factual or a lax, personalized approach to management. The Corps suggests that administrators consider a different change model if educational change is not to be merely cosmetic, a possibility revealed by a case study concerning the detrimental effects racial tension exerted on a specific Teacher Corps project. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177116

MANAGEMENT FOR CHANGE:
IDEOLOGIES OF CONSENSUS AND CONFLICT IN TEACHER CORPS

by

Gerald J. Pine
Professor of Education

and

Director
University of New Hampshire-Portsmouth Teacher Corps Project
Morrill Hall
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

SP 015 525

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gerald J. Pine

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MANAGEMENT FOR CHANGE:
IDEOLOGIES OF CONSENSUS AND CONFLICT IN TEACHER CORPS

Abstract

Embedded in contemporary management theory and practice are ideologies which inhibit educational change. Educational administrators and innovators need to become aware of the ideologies hidden in systematic management and organizational development theory if they truly wish to provide creative leadership in initiating and implementing educational change. This article is an analysis of the values and ideologies inherent in systematic management and organizational development. The article suggests that administrators ought to incorporate a different change model in their approach to management if educational change is not to be merely cosmetic.

Introduction

Change through collaboration and cooperation is what Teacher Corps is all about. Teacher Corps projects are organized efforts for change designed to: operationalize different educational approaches that integrate the training of new and experienced teachers;[1] demonstrate better ways for schools and teachers to function using educational products, processes, people, and practices on site within the schools; create comprehensive approaches for educational change and reform through the collaboration of universities, local school systems, state educational agencies, and local communities.[2] Through collaboration Teacher Corps projects attempt to introduce and demonstrate needed innovation and change to increase the effectiveness of education for low income, special needs and minority group children and their parents - constituencies which are often educationally alienated and disenfranchised.[3]

The complex nature of a Teacher Corps project - the fact that it is a temporary organization existing within a limited time frame in a temporary relationship with a university and a local school system, two permanent institutions and social systems with different norms, values and behavioral regularities - generates a number of challenging, unique, and sophisticated problems.[4] Although a project may be physically located at a specific school site and within a specific university department, the workplace of the Teacher Corps project is actually an environment formed by: committees and subgroups within these two organizations; professional organizations; community organizations and parents; and other community social service agencies. Within this environment Teacher

Corps attempts to affect education by having: 1. impact on the educational experiences of disadvantaged children; 2. impact on the experiences of those who influence these children in home, school, and community; 3. impact on the institutions that initially shape and then maintain the role of these "influencers"; and 4. impact on the specific training and retraining programs within those institutions. The creation, operation, and continuing development of a Teacher Corps project requires a constant awareness of the changing relationships among these various objectives, which may serve as both "means" and "ends" for the project.

Teacher Corps is not an independent organization with control over all of the major processes that influence its products. In fact, its "products" or outcomes, will be, to a great extent, under the control of others - the school, the community, and the college. The form of control that the Teacher Corps project does command is an indirect one which uses processes such as facilitation, collaboration, and brokering to accomplish mutual objectives. To do this, the project is held accountable for the maintenance of certain management processes that create opportunities for involvement and participation around issues of mutual self interest. In its funding criteria and legislation, Teacher Corps calls for the inclusion of a clearly developed plan for project management in the initial project application and Teacher Corps has long been an advocate of systematic management techniques, both in training (e.g. teaching modules, competency-based systems) and in project management (e.g. PERT, objectives-based management, discrepancy evaluation, MIS).[5] Systematic management techniques are selected by projects to assure efficient and productive program development, group development,

and documentation activities and the project director or management team is expected to choose, adapt, and often invent techniques that provide focus, climate, and control for achieving these ends.[6]

Systematic management theory and practice have emanated from the scientific management movement of Frederick Winslow Taylor which emphasized a concern for task accomplishment (output) and the human relations movement of Elton Mayo which stressed a concern for relationships (people).[7] The recognition of these two concerns has characterized the writings on leadership and management ever since the conflict between the scientific management and human relations schools of thought became apparent. The language, assumptions, and thought of systematic management also have been influenced by developments and concepts in general systems theory, cybernetics, information theory, game theory, decision theory, topology, factor analysis, operations research, and systems engineering.[8] The language of systematic management includes such words and phrases as: input, thoughtput, output, mission, goals, objectives, efficiency, order, control, information systems, feedback loops, impact analysis, flow charts, timelines, networks, needs assessment, products, task analysis, systems analysis, analysis systems, organizational diagnosis, conflict management, force field analysis, freezing and unfreezing. The vocabulary as well as the history and tradition of systematic management appear to be scientific, objective, and neutral. But systematic management (and this includes organizational development) techniques are not neutral and objective; concealed in systematic management techniques and group technologies are ideologies and values which inhibit and work against the achievement of Teacher Corps' generic mission - the introduction and accomplishment of educational change on behalf of low income, special

needs, and minority group children. This article is an analysis of the values and ideologies inherent in systematic management and organizational development. It will explicate tacit assumptions, identify critical issues relating to management and change, and suggest a different starting place for launching change. A basic assumption of this analysis is that while systematic management may contribute to the achievement of educational change, there are certain fundamental and significant problems that should be noted. An understanding and recognition of these problems suggest that management theory ought to incorporate a different change model if change is not to be merely cosmetic.

Ideologies

Since one of the major purposes of this article is the analysis of ideologies hidden in systematic management, a preliminary exploration and discussion of ideology is required. Wax[9] defines ideology as "those socially legitimated ideas, concepts, and symbols used by individuals to provide positive interpretations for the lives and actions open to them within their institutional settings." Individuals want positive self-images; they want meanings which make positive sense of what they do and who they are. They are, however, born into a world they never made and their options are largely determined by the institutional frameworks in which they find themselves. They must determine their roles within institutional positions constrained by norms, and this whole social "mechanism," while not in its entirety a product of conscious human design, is nonetheless shaped by the decisions of members of socially more powerful classes and tends to serve their interests. The injustices,

the indignities, the out and out brutalities which result can cause depression or even paralysis. Ideologies keep the life-force moving, by guising or sugar coating depressing acts of life and by defining projects possible within the institutional framework, which may be conceived as innocent or even positive.

Most people seem to agree that one can talk about ideology as referring to some sort of "system" of ideas, beliefs, fundamental commitments, or values about social reality, but here the agreement ends.[10] The interpretations differ according to both the scope or range of the phenomena which are presumably ideological and the function -- what ideologies actually do for the people who "have" them. Interpretations of the scope of ideology vary widely. The phenomena under it can be grouped into at least three categories: (1) quite specific rationalizations or justifications of the activities of particular and identifiable occupational groups (e.g., professional ideologies); (2) broader political programs and social movements; and (3) comprehensive worldviews, outlooks, or what some have called symbolic universes. Functionally, ideology has been evaluated historically as a form of false consciousness which distorts one's picture of social reality and serves the interests of the dominant classes in a society. However, it has also been treated as systems of interacting symbols that provide the primary ways for making "otherwise incomprehensible social situations meaningful," that is, as inevitable creations that are essential and function as shared conventions of meaning for making a complex social reality understandable.

These distinctions about the function of ideology are, of course, no more than ideal types, poles between which fall most positions on the question of what ideology is and what it does. Both ideal typical positions do grow from traditions, though, and have their modern proponents.

The former, what has been called the "interest theory" of ideology, perceives ideology's primary role as the justification of vested interests of existing or contending political, economic, or other groups. The latter pole, the tradition of "strain theory," takes as ideology's most important function its role of providing meaning in problematic situations, as giving a usable "definition of the situation," in this way making it possible for individuals and groups to act.

Teacher Corps: An Ideological Dilemma

A major ideological dilemma of Teacher Corps is the commitment on one hand to cooperative, collaborative, and participatory models of governance and decision making and the requirement on the other hand for systematic, efficient, and objective management. The tension of this dilemma probably has been experienced by most Teacher Corps project directors and staffs at one time or another at critical points in their projects. Parity representation, cooperative planning, and collaborative leadership as articulated by Teacher Corps are ideas found in the radical educational reform ideology of the sixties and early seventies which endorses: intense participation in decision making; new means to govern schools more democratically; the elimination of role distinctions among students, parents, teachers, and administrators; and consensual decision making based on face to face interactions.[11] The pure application of this ideology encourages governance structures and patterns of interpersonal relations that normally would facilitate conflict.

But an ideology which can generate conflict does not seem compatible with the ideology of efficiency. Teacher Corps requires systematic management approaches presumably because systematic management is

able to resolve the potentially conflicting norms, values, and behavioral regularities of public schools, universities, and community agencies.[12] How? By eliminating from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements. Systematic management is functional then because - in theory - it supplants the inefficient with the efficient, the unpredictable and the unique with the predictable and patterned, subjective quirks and biases with impersonal, rational, and objective procedures, and slow and tedious hit-or-miss methods with smooth precodified and semiautomatic routines.

Teacher Corps attempts to address this ideological dilemma by synthesizing elements of "humanistic democratic collaborative" ideology with elements of "efficient scientific management" ideology into collaborative systematic management which incorporates the hard technology of scientific management and the soft technology of organizational development. But an analysis of collaborative systematic management reveals serious problems that get in the way of accomplishing fundamental educational and organizational change. As we shall see, an ideological synthesis which ignores or mitigates the integrative functions of conflict and which accentuates efficient systematic collaborative modes of management has inherent difficulties and contradictions.

The Mythology of Neutrality

Systematic management procedures are not interest and value free. In discussing the values evident in, and perpetuated through, such supposedly scientific procedures as systems management, Apple[13] notes how systems language performs a political function by convincing others of the sophisticated state of the field of education and by evoking tacit

meanings from the general audience that are basically supportive of a quasi-scientific belief system. Order and consensus are extremely important for the proper functioning of systems management procedures; conflict and disorder are antithetical to a smoothly functioning system:

> "It should be clear, then, that systems approaches are not essentially neutral, nor are they only performing a 'scientific' function. By tending to cause its users and the other publics involved to ignore certain possible fundamental problems with schools as institutions, systems management also acts to generate and channel political sentiments supportive of the existing modes of access to knowledge and power."[14]

Apple argues that systems management rests on a set of hidden beliefs which, when examined, is often unrealistic and socially and politically conservative. These assumptions are concerned with the tacit advocacy of a view negating the importance of intellectual conflict, a limited perspective on scientific endeavor, an inability to deal with ambiguity, and finally, a separation of moral and technical questions.[15]

Others, like Passmore,[16] have addressed the problem of terminological bias, saying that scientific sounding words like "efficiency" often disguise value judgments, and that seemingly factual statements often imply value judgments or even formulation of social policy. House[17] identifies some underlying values of systems management:

> componentiality: reality can be easily separated into neat components
>
> multirelationality: an individual can be fragmented into all the relationships he/she must maintain in society
>
> makeability: problems can always be solved, and
>
> progressivity: it is desirable to maximize the benefits of any action

Apple suggests that systems management procedures actually enable managers to avoid conflicts over basic values by making choices within

the limited framework of existing modes of interaction and by precluding questions about the basis of the structure itself. Using scientific terminology this way serves to deemphasize value conflicts and to portray decisions as factual or reality-based judgments.[18]

The technology and language of systems management approaches shape the minds of those who use them and obscure the fundamental aim of systems management procedures, i.e., effecting and maintaining technical control and certainty. However, the systems management procedures that are effective for developing a rocket are not necessarily effective for helping people to achieve meaning in life and for dealing with the competing political, moral, and intensely personal conceptions of valuable educational activity. Uncertainty, ambiguity and conflict are the very fabric of life, the very nature of being human. Eliminating them is a contradiction. Unfortunately, the philosophy of gradualism, one of the ideological underpinnings of systematic management, has influenced our belief systems so that we prize order, control, predictability, consensus and planned change over the human dimensions of uncertainty, ambiguity, unpredictability, and conflict-elements which accompany the political, ethical, and moral issues found in any complex educational activity or innovation.

The Ideology of Gradualism

The intellectual roots and tacit values of systematic management reflect the ideology of gradualism which supports the gradualistic evolutionary cooperative approach to change that characterizes educational innovation. Recently the scientific validity of gradualism has come under question leading to significant implications for educators inter-

ested in educational change and reform. Gradualism is a philosophy of change, not an induction from nature. Stephen Jay Gould in his essay "Evolution: Explosion, Not Ascent,"[19] notes that when Darwin adopted gradualism as his firm view of evolutionary change, he argued more from tradition than from observation. Darwin was influenced by: the views of J.B. Sumner, the Archbishop of Canterbury who held that discontinuous change is a criterion of supernatural intervention since all natural change must be gradual; and the work of Charles Lyell who, in his reformulation of geology, postulated a stately world of slow, steady and gradual change without direction. Backed by the prestige of Darwin and Lyell, gradualism triumphed in the 19th century and prevailed until recently among natural and social scientists almost as an exclusive orthodoxy. Gould argues that gradualism is now beginning to unravel in field after field and that the evidence of geology indicates that punctuational change, i.e., sudden, abrupt replacement and rapid flips mark the history of most species.[20] Many other disciplines are now considering alternate models of punctuational change and economists, ecologists, physicists and anthropologists are constructing mathematical models and theories of catastrophic transformation to challenge the conventional wisdom of gradualistic evolution.

Why did gradualism become so popular and exert its hegemony for so long? Gould suggests that the answer must lie partially in nature, for some change is slow and continuous but the utility of gradualism as an ideology must explain much of its influence, for it became liberalism's quintessential dogma against radical change - sudden flips are against the laws of nature.[21] Gould asserts that gradualism's strong ideological components have been more responsible for its previous success than any

objective matching with nature:

> "As gradualism unravels in many areas, it becomes important to understand what supported it in the first place. Scientists tend to assume that such prevailing assumptions arise inductively from patterns in data, obviously perceived. But nature is maddeningly multifarious, - it speaks ambiguously on any issue so cosmic as the nature of change. Shared assumptions often reflect a cultural and political climate more than they record the constraints of scientific data. Gradualism has complex roots, but its role as a general ideology must not be underrated; it became the standard argument among 19th century liberals trying to preserve the social order against increasing threats (and practices) of revolution."[22]

The gradualistic evolutionary model of change, then, has served vested social interests and currently serves vested interests as a subliminal ideology pervading contemporary educational innovation and reform. As a philosophy of change, it has nourished the consensus model of thought which has profoundly affected American educational tradition and practice.

The Consensus Model of Thought

The consensus model of thought is mirrored in both organizational development and systems management. Jackson Kytle[23] in his critique of the technological ethos of the "change industry" elaborates Israel's[24] two competing conceptual models of change: the conflict model and the consensus model. The point of divergence for the models is inequality. The conflict model treats inequality as the central contradiction causing competition between the classes. The consensus model, in contrast, focuses primarily upon mechanisms allowing structural inequalities to be negotiated, the most important one being commitment to shared moral or political goals. In the conflict model disequilibrium is seen as necessary and desirable, whereas the consensus model assumes that balance and stability are the norm.

Kytle[25] argues that organizational development is predicated on a

consensus paradigm. Organizational development theory assumes that conflict is endemic within organizations and that uncontrolled conflict within an organization impedes organizational health. The goal of organizational development is to reduce internal conflict by increasing individual "ownership" (psychological ownership, not material ownership) of organizational goals and processes using the techniques of survey feedback and conflict management. Kytle concludes that organizational development is ideologically loaded in favor of management and institutional/organizational interests; that it tends to support traditional organizational/institutional values while muting dissent along the way; and that most of the long range changes produced by organizational development programs are cosmetic with the basic economic and political structures of the organization remaining untouched.[26]

The intellectual history and tradition of organizational development theory would seem to support Kytle. Braverman[27] observes that organizational development and human relations have been touted as a replacement for Taylorism (Frederick Taylor is regarded as the father of scientific management) but that Taylor introduced his ideas on the segmentation of labor with the same progressive and humanistic language. The avoidance of conflict and the promotion of equilibrium or a state of collaboration constitute the main programmatic orientation of Elton Mayo and Roethlisberger whose research (the Hawthorne Studies) and work in establishing personnel departments and human relations movement in industry form one of the major theoretical bases of organizational development.[28] According to Coser, their trained incapacity to understand conflicts of interest is evident in all their writings. Coser[29] also observes that Kurt Lewin developed a strangely contradictory attitude toward conflict.

Initially, he stood for a militant position emphasizing the need to engage resolutely in conflict activity to maintain and insure the existence of the group, but then he moved to the position of avoiding conflicts through social management and group skills.[30]

In his critique of the consensus/conflict dichotomy, Kytle recommends that social psychology attend to the history of its contributions to applied areas and commands the attention of those who wish to understand the consensus psychology of organizational development:

> "The theory and practice of organizational development, not to mention other group based technologies, is heavily dependent upon major elements of mainstream social psychology such as field theory, theories of cooperation and competition, interpersonal attraction, bargaining, attribution theory and group dynamics. It is also noteworthy, in this connection, that community organization programs do not draw very much upon mainstream social psychology because the liberal cooperative orientation of the latter is usually irrelevant to the situations of conflict and confrontation encountered in community organizing work. In general, social psychology has not been sufficiently concerned with its application to concrete social situations and seems virtually unaware of how its implicit values of consensus, cooperation, conflict resolution and the like have been ideologically loaded in favor of the dominant entrepreneurial and professional elites in our society."[31]

The consensus model of thought not only undergirds organizational development theory but also systems management approaches. Apple[32] sees the way order and conflict are mirrored in systems management approaches used in education as indicative of a constitutive rule of activity that causes most of us to view order as positive and conflict as negative:

> "Order becomes a psychological necessity. This is rather important. As I mentioned before, systems approaches attempt to bring about a technical solution to political and value problems. There is nothing odd about this occurrence. Most advanced industrial societies seem to transform their ethical, political, and aesthetic questions, for instance, into engineering problems. Profound conflict between opposing ideological and moral positions are translated into puzzles to be solved by technical

> expertise. Now, when questioned about the tendency to eliminate conflict, or redefine it, and search for consensus, proponents of systems management in education could and do, in fact, take the position that they are merely trying to be scientific about their problems....The perspective they have of science is notably inaccurate....The history of science and the growth of individual disciplines, has not proceeded by consensus. In fact, most important progress in these fields has been occasioned by intense conflict, both intellectual and interpersonal, and by conceptual revolution."[33]

The consensus model of thought found in organizational development and systems management theories is deeply embedded in the entire cultural web of education. American educators have been imbued with the cultural illusion that all progress in education evolves inevitably and properly from a consensual integration of confluent tending social circumstances and values ordering the universe as a whole, the social system, and particularly formal education.[34] Reitman suggests that most educators have historically been "collaborationists" in their thinking, and this kind of thinking reinforced by the collective wisdom of HEW and NIE persists into the modern age where it is increasingly likely to fail to help achieve desired and desirable societal and institutional reintegration and equilibrium.[35]

The consensus model of thought still taken for granted by most educators assumes that the social system is a holistic enterprise with all cultural and demographic elements ideally fitting together in a well-integrated fashion. Vested interests that have legitimated their power control the enterprise and inevitably resist efforts to bring about changes in the core normative structure of that enterprise.[36] If change is unavoidable, it emerges gradually from perceived disjunctions in the structure of a system or from accretion, in the form of modest additions to the status quo - never major replacements - and is grudgingly harmonized

with existing cultural patterns. Cooperation and collaboration among all well enculturated members, including "loyal" innovators are the keynotes of change, as are rational dialogue and progressive modification of system patterns.[37] Change tends to be viewed from a perspective of moderation, rationality, collaboration, avoidance of rebelliousness by proponents of reform, and preservation of whatever existing patterns are possible. Reitman believes that this change ethos is dysfunctional and that the pervasiveness of the consensus model of thought is the fundamental reason that many once-promising educational innovations and reforms have failed to materialize:

> "The failure of practically every important educational reform proposal made in the past seventy-five years.... can, in the final analysis, be traced to the inability of large numbers of actual or potential reform-minded educators and their allies to appreciate the necessity and the legitimacy of truly original thought and, attendantly, individual and collective dissent at times on behalf of needed changes in the structure and function of the institution. This type of thought and behavior is required whenever a highly significant proposal for change is made, since such proposals are almost invariably strongly resisted by powerful individuals and groups possessing vested interests in preserving the status quo at practically any cost."[38]

According to Mann, many people deny the possibility of any change in education except through the cooperative route, and "that attitude seems to be as much a description of the problem as a valid conclusion. The purpose of public policy remains the regular achievement of public goods - under many circumstances but especially in instances of conflict or disagreement which are after all the most significant environment for public policy."[39] The danger in embracing management technologies is that their language and use can dull our sensitivities to hidden values and ideologies which deny the positive and integrative functions of conflict as the engine of educational change.

The Ethical Use of Conflict

Values and assumptions about human activity in society are important for all levels of educational change theory and practice even though their immediate meaning may not be obvious. A theory of educational change by definition must presuppose at some point in time a theory of alienation, dislocation, and conflict. To focus on the functional aspects of conflict is not to deny that certain functions of conflict are destructive or that they lead to disintegration of organizations and social structures. Such focusing, however, serves to correct a balance of analysis which has been tilted in the other direction. In a series of basic propositions distilled primarily from the theories of Georg Simmel,[40] Lewis Coser has clarified the integrative functions of conflict. His seminal and powerful work has significant implications for management theory and practice and for educational change which can only be summarized here. In clarifying the concept of social conflict, Coser identifies several positive values of conflict:[41]

> Conflict within a group may help to establish unity or to reestablish unity and cohesion where it has been threatened by hostile and antagonistic feelings among members. Whether internal conflict promises to be a means of equilibration or social relations or readjustment of rival claims, or whether it threatens to tear apart depends on the organization's or social structure's tolerance of conflict.
>
> Conflict usually takes place within a common universe of norms and rules and leads to the establishment and extension of such norms and rules. In the course of conflict new rules are continuously created and old rules modified. By bringing about new situations, which are partly or totally undefined by rules and norms, conflict acts as a stimulus for the establishment of new rules and norms.
>
> Conflict brings into the conscious awareness of the contenders and of the community at large norms and rules that were dormant before the particular conflict. By reaffirming dormant norms conflict intensifies participation in social life and decision making.

> Conflict makes possible a reassessment of relative power and thus serves as a balancing mechanism which helps to maintain and consolidate social structures and organizations.
>
> Conflict creates associations and coalitions by bringing together otherwise unrelated persons and groups. Coalitions and temporary associations can produce agreement and change out of relationships of competition and further stimulate social participation.

How can these propositions inform our vision and practice? What can be extrapolated from Coser's work which will advance the accomplishment of educational change? The following suggestions for using conflict in managing Teacher Corps and other educational change projects come to mind:

1. Explicitly incorporate opposing values into evaluation studies of the change project by conducting comparative analyses.[42] Such studies might employ tests of critical competitors[43] and political benefit analyses.

   > Just as economic cost benefit analyses added the vital dimension of cost to the analysis of outcomes, political-benefit analysis might help to resolve questions about political benefits and foregone opportunities.[44]

2. Actively search out conflicting value positions to insure an appreciation and understanding of and an open dialogue about the full range of potentially influential and competing values. Good examples of this approach are the adversary procedure[45] and the judicial evaluation approach[46] which adapts and modifies certain concepts from both jury trials and administrative hearings in the field of law.

3. The development and implementation of educational innovation and change is inherently a political and moral process as well as a technical process. Every now and then educational change agents need to step back and reflect on their work and keep in mind

that use of systematic management techniques can obscure the fact that members of a management team make important ethical decisions about human beings. Moral consciousness raising ought to be a consistent item on a project's agenda so that project managers and their staff can explicate and deal with the difficult ethical, ideological and social problems that are inherent in a complex change project such as Teacher Corps. This can be accomplished by scheduling "conflict retreats" which offer project staff and constituents the opportunity to assemble at a neutral site to articulate and clearly define conflicts in values, goals, interests, and ideologies. Out of "conflict retreats" moral, ethical, and philosophical agenda which impinge on change can be developed as a framework for organizational and educational reformation.

4. Ethically use conflict and crises to generate and accelerate substantial change.[47] Alinsky's[48] community organization approach which uses a change strategy based on a conflict model offers some concrete and useful ideas which can be incorporated into an educational change effort. The concept of conflict as the engine of educational change has also been well developed by Hottleman.[49]

5. Employ competitive demonstration approaches within the same project. There are many ways of teaching reading, for example, which can be implemented through an inservice program. Rather than buy into one system of reading demonstration, a Teacher Corps project may achieve greater payoff for students by funding competing approaches on the condition that

a common measure of reading achievement be used as a pre and post test assessment for all approaches. The advocates and adherents of competing approaches would come together to select a common measuring instrument and then would go their separate ways to compete with each other to prove that their way of teaching reading is the best. There would be no restrictions or controls (other than ethical or legal) on any particular approach, and teachers would be free to use whatever resources they could garner to make their approaches work. To fuel competition a prize of one thousand dollars could be awarded to the teacher(s) whose approach proved to be the most effective in improving reading achievement. How can students not win in a situation in which people are competing with each other to do their very best to improve reading?

Conflict is ubiquitous in human life in the sense that flight is ubiquitous in the existence of most birds. It is simply a mode of action, a method of achieving goals in the social context. Its elimination would require the condition that no human beings would ever desire the achievement of incompatible goals, and this in turn would require either the social isolation of all human beings or the physiological transformation of all persons but one into willless zombies.[50] "The pursuit of change in American schools must take place in the context of a pluralistic society. A plural democracy ultimately grounds its values in the differences among individual members. The clash of values which is so clearly present in site resistance to change is the clash of legitimately differing interests. Many of our most interesting public situations

involve such rights-in-conflict. They are intriguing and demanding exactly because they are the context of leadership."[51]

Conclusion

Implicitly, the conflict model of change is as ideological as the consensus model, but it uses different assumptions and values. What this suggests is that a significant part of management as a field must be committed to the responsibility of becoming a critical science. Its primary function is to be emancipatory in that it critically reflects on education's interest in keeping most, if not all, aspects of human behavior in schools under technical control.[52] Such a responsibility is rooted in seeking out and illuminating the ideological and epistemological presuppositions of management thought. It seeks to make educational innovators and managers more self and ideologically aware in dealing with the complexities and subtleties of initiating educational change and in developing more effective ideas about change to incorporate into management theory and practice.

Change Casualties: A Case Study

> "Without saying very much about it, we all recognize the fact that the conduct of human business must cause pain among those who carry it on. In any large-scale engineering project such as erecting a building, a bridge, or a dam, it is taken for granted by the engineers that a certain number of people will be crippled and a certain number will die. When a large engineering project is completed without a death, engineers congratulate one another. When a stretch of highway is built, it is built with the firm knowledge of all concerned that some of the workmen will be hurt; beyond that, all know that the highway will soon be stained with the blood of some of its users.
>
> People enter the profession of medicine with the sure knowledge that a certain number of them must catch the diseases of their patients. People enter business schools and go into high-pressure occupations under the known risk of psychosomatic ailments and various neuroses. Schools are built with the sure knowledge that those who "fail" in them will be psychologically damaged and marked for life." *

*Philip J. Runkel, "The Inevitability of Pain" in R.A. Schmuck et. al. The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1977, pp. 217-218

It was just before April 15 and I had not prepared my tax return, but that was the farthest thought from my mind because I was simply about to be fired from my job, a fate not entirely uncontemplated but nevertheless disturbing both to me and to a significant number of students and a small group of parents in the community. Students and walls wore "PIERCE" signs, many students stayed out of class for three days to protest, and Black Power people outside the school became involved.

Events leading to this climax had begun in Thayer City. I was thirty-six and had just received my Ph.D. in curriculum development and educational leadership. Jobs and money were hard to come by; the depression in education had begun three years before and I was desperately searching for positions which would give me the opportunity to influence education to really meet the needs of kids and also challenge and stretch me enough so that I would continue to grow. Although I was offered several positions, none of them seemed to be what I was looking for. Finally, I was offered a position as the Director of a Career Education Project which had as its ultimate objective curriculum and organizational change in Resistance High School, which reflected in its student population the racial mix of the community - seventy percent white and thirty percent black.

I began my project mission well indoctrinated with several "truths." The year started, and I embarked on my well conceived and collaboratively planned crusade. The project was well funded and I had a staff of three professionals, the best and the brightest among the candidates who had applied for the staff positions. They were selected by a committee representing all the constituencies of the project including the school administration and teaching staff. We were all still young enough to be idealistic, somewhat arrogant, overconfident, over-

dressed, overdegreed, and undereducated change agents.

Beginner's luck was with us for a while and like most projects we went through a honeymoon period with the school administration and staff. We followed the principles of sound management and organizational development right down the line. We listened and we listened well to teachers who we discovered are like most people, lonely for someone who will listen. We carried out a needs assessment process with the students, teachers, and the community. We met with numerous citizen groups; formed a project advisory committee consisting of teachers, students, parents, and community representatives; and we developed objectives, PERT/CPM task analyses, timelines, and job specifications based on the input from students, teachers, and parents. We had some conflicts along the way but were able to work these through and patted ourselves on the back for our success as mediators and facilitators in bringing diverse vested interests together. Cooperation and collaboration were our key words as we saw a new curriculum based on career education concepts begin to take hold. But despite our apparent success, we began to get the uneasy feeling that new courses, work-study programs, reading materials, curriculum immersion in career education, and new approaches to instruction were only scratching the surface. Something was missing and something was happening to me. I began to see that the project was misdirected and was deflecting the school's and the community's energy and attention away from the consistent but subtle tensions which existed between Blacks and whites. Our collaborative and cooperative planning had been programmed because we had bought into the goals of the project to begin with - we were focusing on career education and not on race relations. Our needs assessment, our planning, our management system, everything had been shaped by the unspoken philosophy of the career education movement. We, in effect, were helping to grease the people wheels of the economy and not paying much attention to

the pervasive racism in Resistance High.

I shared my observations with the project staff and after several hours of soul searching we agreed that the project needed to be redirected and arranged to meet with the Superintendent, High School Principal and representatives of the teaching staff. Our observations and recommendations were not well received and we were advised to "get on with the project." After several frustrating and enervating weeks of using all the human relations and change strategies in the book, we decided to make our case with the Project Advisory Committee which included the Superintendent, High School Principal, and one of the teacher representatives we had met with. All Hell broke loose at that meeting. Though few in number, all the Black members of the committee along with three whites began to bring long dormant racial issues out in a way nobody had heard before and by the time the meeting ended, racism was well on its way to becoming the number one educational issue in Thayer City. The next day the newspapers carried the story about our meeting and stamped racism as the most critical problem confronting Resistance High School and called for cool and calm heads to address the problem. Our project staff designed a plan to bring students and teacher representatives together to begin to work on the problem. As planned, students and teachers were to go off together on an island for a weekend. The students were school leaders. "Formal" leaders were student government types and elected class officers. "Informal" leaders were influential blacks and others. Given the circumstances and the encouragement from an influential black student and myself, the weekend turned into an intense racial awareness encounter.

In the students' opinion and the project staff's, the weekend was productive. Blacks and whites became more aware of barriers that stood between them. Those barriers began to lower under the power of mutual openness and the sharing of food and time. Although some of the teachers did not share our optimistic view

of the weekend, all the faculty representatives agreed to support racial awareness activities. To cultivate what had begun, Resistance students, project staff, and I planned for the future and held meetings when we returned.

Although frustrated from the start by administrative disapproval and thinly veiled hostility from some key faculty members, we reached some students through informal talks and lectures; but our activities diminished as we became increasingly discouraged by the lack of school support. Several times we were asked to speak with school administrators about the wisdom and necessity of the group, its plans, and my own role in its activities. The tenor of the talks changed from concerned interest to subtle hints that my job was on the line. My standing improved as the group's activities decreased, but this state was not to last for long.

With the approach of Black History Week (a cosmetic curriculum happening which represented the epitome of tokenism), members of the original group decided to meet again and develop a real program of substance for Resistance High. The principal's approval and the faculty council's endorsement were needed for the plan and although neither the principal nor the council flatly refused us, they did inform us that they were not in favor of our activities. Our program went on, but it gained for me even more mileage down the unemployment path. I soon found out that my chances of being fired were approaching ninety-nine forty four/ one hundred percent certainty. Word of my situation reached the student body from a few of my student friends.

For three days my future became the focus of most of the school. Students stayed out of class. Black Power people outside the school involved themselves. It became crucial for the school administration to dampen a potentially explosive situation. The school board called meetings and administrators met with Resistance students. The meetings helped to defuse the situation and also resulted in some

new policies and plans. The school board developed guidelines to improve the education of blacks. In Resistance, procedures were established to improve communication among faculty, administration, and the student body; to teach Black History; to establish a school system wide multicultural curriculum; to form a Parent-Teacher Council in place of the Faculty Council; and to appoint an ombudsman to deal with student and parent concerns. After things had quieted down, I was told that the school system would not submit a proposal for continuation of the project I was directing. It was summer time, the fiscal year had ended, students and parents were enjoying the lazy warmth and the good things of life which only summer can bring. I left Thayer City quietly without any fuss and eventually found a faculty position at a State College. A few months after my faculty appointment, I encountered one of my former students who told me that life at Resistance High School had changed dramatically. Several months after I had left, the principal announced his impending resignation. He and I were both casualties in the war of change. I like to think I accomplished some good. I don't know how he feels.

References

1. W. L. Smith, "Facing the Next Ten Years," Journal of Teacher Education, Summer 1975, Vol. 26, No. 2, p. 151.

2. Ibid.

3. J. P. Steffensen, "Teacher Corps: A Nervous Decade of Educational Innovation," Journal of Teacher Education, Summer 1975, Vol. 26, No. 2, p. 110-111.

4. H. K. Spriggs. Site Specific Orientation Program Information Materials. Published by Southeastern Recruitment and Technical Resource Center of Teacher Corps, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1976, p. 54-56.

5. Ibid., p. 56.

6. R. Goddu, "Application of Systematic Management Techniques in Teacher Corps Projects," Chapter 1, p. 1-5.

7. P. Hersey and K. H. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, 3rd. ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1977, p. 91.

8. N. R. Stewart, et. al. Systematic Counseling. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1978, p. 33-40.

9. L. J. Waks, "The Ideology of Schooling and Work," Eye on Education, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1978, p. 7.

10. Michael Diamonti. Personal correspondence, 1978. The remaining section of this discussion on ideology has been developed by my colleague Michael Diamonti.

11. W. A. Firestone, "Ideology and Conflict in Parent Run Free Schools," Sociology of Education, Vol. 49, No. 2, April 1976, p. 169-175.

12. Michael Diamonti. Personal correspondence, 1978.

13. M. W. Apple, "The Adequacy of Systems Management Procedures in Education," Journal of Educational Research, September 1972, Vol. 66, No. 1, p. 14.

14. Ibid., p. 15.

15. Ibid., p. 17-18.

16. J. A. Passmore, "Can the Social Sciences Be Value Free?" In H. S. Broudy, R. H. Ennis, and L. I. Krimerman (Eds). Philosophy of Educational Research, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

17. E. R. House, "Technology and Evaluation," Educational Technology, Vol. 13, No. 11, 1973, p. 20-26.

18. Apple, op. cit., p. 15-16.

19. S. J. Gould, "Evolution: Explosion Not Ascent," New York Times. Sunday, January 22, 1978, p. 6E.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. J. Kytle, "Ideology and Planned Social Change: A Critique of Two Popular Change Strategies," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 4, Fall 1977, p. 697-706.

24. J. Israel, "Stipulations and Construction in the Social Sciences," In J. Israel and H. Tajfel (eds). The Context of Social Psychology, New York: Academic Press, 1972.

25. Kytle, op. cit., p. 700-701.

26. Ibid., p. 701.

27. H. Braverman. Labor and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

28. Hersey and Blanchard, op. cit., p. 51-54.

29. L. Coser. The Functions of Social Conflict, New York: The Free Press, 1956, p. 24-26.

30. Ibid., p. 25.

31. Kytle, op. cit., p. 705.

32. Apple, op. cit., p. 17.

33. Ibid.

34. S. W. Reitman, "The Limitations of Consensus As A Model of Educational Reform," Teachers College Record, Vol. 78, No. 3, p. 337.

35. Ibid., p. 338.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid., p. 339.

38. Ibid., p. 342.

39. D. Mann, "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools," Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, No. 36, February 1976, p. 326.

40. George Simmel. Conflict, trans. Kurt H. Wolff. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

41. Coser, op. cit., p. 151-157.

42. N. L. Smith, "Sources of Values Influencing Educational Evaluation," Research Evaluation Development Paper Series, No. 7, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, May 1977, p. 26.

43. M. Scriven, "Standards for the Evaluation of Educational Programs and Products." In G. D. Borich (Ed). Evaluating Educational Programs and Products, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology and Publications, 1974.

44. C. H. Weiss, "Where Politics and Evaluation Research Meet," Evaluation, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1973, p. 37-45.

45. M. Levine, "Scientific Method and the Adversary Model," American Psychologist, Vol. 29, No. 9, 1974, p. 661-667.

46. R. L. Wolf, "Trial By Jury: A New Evaluation Method," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 57, No. 3, November 1975, p. 185-187.

47. D. Mann, "The User Driven System," Management Training Institute, New England Teacher Corps, Hyannis, Massachusetts, July 1977.

48. S. Alinsky. Rules for Radicals, New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

49. G. D. Hottleman, "Hierarchy and Egalitarianism: The Case for the Study of Organizations in the Education of Teachers: An Organizer's View." In R. G. Corwin and R. A. Edelfelt Perspectives on Organizations. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977, p. 58-71.

50. N. A. Bailey and S. M. Feder. Operational Conflict Analysis. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1973.

51. D. Mann, "Making Change Happen," Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, No. 3, February 1977, p. 322.

52. Apple, op. cit., p. 21.